UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,668	12/30/2003	Theodore S. Moise IV	TI-36398	9759

23494 7590 12/20/2007

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER	
KALAM, ABUL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2814	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/20/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/749,668	MOISE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ABUL KALAM	2814	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,21 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5, 21 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 12, 2007, has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In lines 11-12 of claim 22, the limitation of "wherein at least one of the capacitor stacks comprises a conductive contact formed thereover and thereunder," is unclear and indefinite because Applicant claims that the same conductive contact is formed both over the capacitor stack and under the capacitor stack. Furthermore, in lines 13-14, the limitation of "wherein the conductive contact has a cross section near a contact portion with the top portion of the stack and the bottom portion of the stack," is also unclear and indefinite because Applicant claims that the same conductive contact has a

cross section near both the top portion of the stack and bottom portion of the stack. For examining purposes, the limitations in lines 11-15, will be interpreted as: "wherein at least one of the capacitor stacks has a conductive contact formed over the capacitor stack, and wherein the conductive contact has a cross section near a contact portion with the top portion of the capacitor stack that is about as large or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-5, 21 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Moise et al. (US 6,211,035**; newly cited, hereinafter, Moise**)** in view of **Fox et al. (6,627,930**; previously cited, hereinafter, Fox**)**.

With respect to **claim 1, Moise** teaches an integrated circuit comprising:

An array of ferroelectric memory cells **(Figs. 6a-6f; col. 2: lns. 13-16)**, each cell **(col. 8: lns. 64-67)** having a capacitor stack **(624, Fig. 6c)** having an upper electrode **(610, Fig. 6a)**, a lower electrode **(606, Fig. 6a)** and a single ferroelectric core layer **(608, Fig. 6a)**, wherein at least one of the capacitor stacks **(624)** comprises a conductive contact **(604, Fig. 6a)** formed under the single ferroelectric core layer **(608)**, wherein the conductive contact **(604)** has a cross section near a contact portion with the bottom

portion of the stack, that is about as large or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores **(Fig. 6c; col. 9: lns. 1-67, col. 10: lns. 1-13)**.

Thus, **Moise** teaches all the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing: wherein the single ferroelectric core layer has a crystallization in the (001) family and at least 40% of the domains of the single ferroelectric core layer are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

However, **Fox** teaches a capacitor stack **(10_2; FIG. 1B)** having a single ferroelectric core layer **(18)** with a crystallization in the (001) family **(FIG. 1B; col. 4: lns. 1-21)**, wherein at least about 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

Regarding the claimed "at least about 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack," **Fox** discloses that the entire single ferroelectric core layer **(18; FIG. 1B)** has a crystallographic texture of <001>, and thus it is implicit that about 50-100% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack **(see FIG. 1B; col. 4: lns. 9-11, 17-19)**.

Furthermore, note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed*, "at least 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack," or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to based upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of **Fox** into the device of **Moise**, to form the ferroelectric core layer having a crystallographic texture of <001>, because such crystallization structures are generally preferred due to the orientation of the polarization **(col. 4: lns. 17-21)**.

With respect to **claim 2, Moise and Fox** teach the all the limitations of the claim, as set forth above in claim 1, with the exception of disclosing: wherein about 45 to about 75% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

However, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a ferroelectric layer with about 45 to about 75% of the domains functionally oriented, as claimed, because **Fox** teaches ferroelectric layers in which the direction of the polarization magnitude is generally from the bottom electrode toward the top electrode **(col. 4: lns. 9-11)**. Furthermore, note that absent evidence of disclosure of criticality for the range or dimensions giving unexpected results, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges or dimensions by routine experimentation. See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 234 (CCPA 1955).

With respect to **claim 3, Moise and Fox** teach the integrated circuit of claim 1 above. Furthermore, **Moise** teaches wherein the ferroelectric cores are PZT cores **(608, Fig. 6a)**.

Regarding the limitation, "the PZT of each core has a switched polarization of at least about 60 $\mu C/cm^2$," the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed*, "switched polarization of at least about 60 $\mu C/cm^2$," or any

unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to base upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension is critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With respect to **claim 4, Moise and Fox** teach the integrated circuit of claim 1 above. Furthermore, **Moise** teaches a dielectric layer **(1050, Fig. 10c)** covering the array of memory cells **(1024, Fig. 10b)**, the dielectric layer **(1050)** having a conductive contact **(1060, Fig. 10d)** over each ferroelectric core **(608, Fig. 6a)**, the conductive contacts each having a cross section about as large or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores **(Figs. 6a and 10d)**.

With respect to **claim 5, Moise and Fox** teach the integrated circuit of claim 1 above. Furthermore, **Moise** teaches wherein the electrodes **(606, 610; Fig. 6a)** are adjacent opposing sides of the ferroelectric cores **(608, Fig. 6a).**

Regarding the limitation, "electrodes adjacent opposing sides of the ferroelectric cores have a collective thickness of at least about 200 nm thick," the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed*, "collective thickness of at least about 200 nm," or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to base upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension is critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With respect to **claim 21, Moise and Fox** teach the integrated circuit of claim 1 above. Furthermore, **Moise** teaches a dielectric layer **(1070, Fig. 10d)** covering the

array of memory cells, the dielectric layer having an additional conductive contact **(1080, Fig. 10d)** over each ferroelectric core **(608; Figs. 6a-6c)**, the additional conductive contacts **(1080)** having a cross section about as larger or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores **(1024)** and extending through said dielectric layer **(1070)** to a metal interconnect layer **(1062) (Figs. 6a and 10d)**.

With respect to **claim 22**, as best interpreted by the Office**, Moise** teaches an integrated circuit comprising:

An array of ferroelectric memory cells **(Figs. 6a-6f; col. 2: lns. 13-16)**, each cell **(col. 8: lns. 64-67)** having a capacitor stack **(624, Fig. 6c)** comprising:

a lower barrier layer **(602, Fig. 6a)**;

a lower electrode **(606)** over the barrier layer **(602)**;

a single ferroelectric core layer **(608)**;

an upper electrode **(610)** over the single ferroelectric core layer **(608)**; and

an upper barrier **(614)** over the upper electrode **(610)**;

wherein at least one of the capacitor stacks **(624, Fig. 6c)** comprises a conductive contact **(1060, Fig. 10d)** formed over the capacitor stack, wherein the conductive contact **(1060)** has a cross section near a contact portion with the top portion of the capacitor stack **(Fig. 10d)**, that is about as large or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores **(Figs. 6c and 10d; col. 9: lns. 1-67, col. 10: lns. 1-13)**.

Thus, **Moise** teaches all the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing: wherein the single ferroelectric core layer has a crystallization in the (001)

family and at least 40% of the domains of the single ferroelectric core layer are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

However, **Fox** teaches a capacitor stack **(10_2; FIG. 1B)** having a single ferroelectric core layer **(18)** with a crystallization in the (001) family **(FIG. 1B; col. 4: lns. 1-21)**, wherein at least about 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

Regarding the claimed "at least about 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack," **Fox** discloses that the entire single ferroelectric core layer **(18; FIG. 1B)** has a crystallographic texture of <001>, and thus it is implicit that about 50-100% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack **(see FIG. 1B; col. 4: lns. 9-11, 17-19)**.

Furthermore, note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed*, "at least 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack," or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to based upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of **Fox** into the device of **Moise**, to form the ferroelectric core layer having a crystallographic texture of <001>, because such crystallization structures are generally preferred due to the orientation of the polarization **(col. 4: lns. 17-21)**.

3. **Claims 1-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uchiyama et al. (US 6,831,313**; previously cited, hereinafter, Uchiyama**)** in view of **Fox ('930)**.

With respect to **claim 1, Uchiyama** teaches an integrated circuit comprising:

An array of ferroelectric memory cells **(445; col. 11, lines 38-43)**, each cell **(100; FIG. 5)** having a capacitor stack **(128)** having an upper electrode **(126)**, a lower electrode **(122)**, and a single ferroelectric core layer **(124; col. 9: lns. 49-62)**, wherein at least one of the capacitor stacks **(128)** comprises a conductive contact **(121)** formed thereunder, wherein the conductive contact **(121)** has a cross section near a contact portion with the bottom portion of the capacitor stack **(128)**, that is about as large or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores **(124; FIG. 5)**.

Thus, **Uchiyama** teaches all the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing: wherein the single ferroelectric core layer has a crystallization in the (001) family and at least 40% of the domains of the single ferroelectric core layer are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

However, **Fox** teaches a capacitor stack **(10_2; FIG. 1B)** having a single ferroelectric core layer **(18)** with a crystallization in the (001) family **(FIG. 1B; col. 4: lns. 1-21)**, wherein at least about 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

Regarding the claimed "at least about 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack," **Fox** discloses that the entire single ferroelectric core layer **(18; FIG. 1B)** has a crystallographic texture of <001>, and thus it

is implicit that about 50-100% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack **(col. 4: lns. 9-11, 17-19)**.

Furthermore, note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed*, "at least 40% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack," or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to based upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of **Uchiyama** with the teaching of **Fox**, to form the single ferroelectric core layer having a crystallographic texture of <001>, because such crystallization structures are generally preferred due to the orientation of the polarization **(col. 4: lns. 17-21)**.

With respect to **claim 2, Uchiyama and Fox** teach the all the limitations of the claim, as set forth above in claim 1, with the exception of disclosing: wherein about 45 to about 75% of the domains are functionally oriented with respect to the capacitor stack.

However, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a ferroelectric layer with about 45 to about 75% of the domains functionally oriented, as claimed, because **Fox** teaches ferroelectric layers in which the direction of the polarization magnitude is generally from the bottom electrode toward the top electrode

(col. 4: lns. 9-11). Furthermore, note that absent evidence of disclosure of criticality for the range or dimensions giving unexpected results, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges or dimensions by routine experimentation. See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 234 (CCPA 1955).

With respect to **claim 3, Uchiyama and Fox** teach the integrated circuit of claim 1 above. Furthermore, **Fox** teaches wherein the ferroelectric cores are PZT cores **(col. 6, lines 9-37).** Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of **Uchiyama** with the teaching of **Fox**, for the reasons set forth above in claim 1.

Regarding the limitation, "the PZT of each core has a switched polarization of at least about 60 $\mu C/cm^2$," the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed*, "switched polarization of at least about 60 $\mu C/cm^2$," or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to base upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension is critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With respect to **claim 4, Uchiyama and Fox** teach the integrated circuit of claim 1 above. Furthermore, **Uchiyama** teaches a dielectric layer **(142; FIG. 5)** covering the array **(445; col. 11, lines 38-43)** of memory cells **(100)**, the dielectric layer having a conductive contact **(139)** over each ferroelectric core **(124)**, the conductive contact having a cross section about as larger or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores **(124, FIG. 5)** (**col. 10, lns. 9-19; col. 11)**.

With respect to **claim 5, Uchiyama and Fox** teach the integrated circuit of claim 1 above. Furthermore, **Uchiyama** teaches wherein the electrodes **(122, 126)** are adjacent opposing sides of the ferroelectric cores **(124) (col. 9, lns. 49-62).**

Regarding the limitation, "electrodes adjacent opposing sides of the ferroelectric cores have a collective thickness of at least about 200 nm thick," the specification contains no disclosure of either the *critical nature of the claimed*, "collective thickness of at least about 200 nm," or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to base upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimension is critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed October 12, 2007, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, with respect to the Uchiyama et al. (US 6,831,313) reference, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Uchiyama does not disclose wherein the conductive contact has a cross section near a contact portion with the bottom portion of the stack that is about as large or larger than that of the ferroelectric cores. However, the argument is not persuasive, because figure 5 clearly shows that the conductive contact **121** has a larger cross section than the ferroelectric core **124**. Furthermore, layer **121** can be considered a conductive contact since contains titanium **(col. 9: lns. 43-48)**.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abul Kalam whose telephone number is (571)272-8346. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2814

/Phat X Cao/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814